(c) whether this mark up, ranging from 70 to 200 per cent is justified;

(d) whether this is the reason for which no duty concessions granted by Government in respect of PSF, NFY, PFY etc. are reaching the consumer; and

(e) what action Government propoes to take to ensure that such duty concessions which are granted by issuing Notifications in public interest are passed on to the consumers ultimately?

THE MINISTER OF TEXTILES WITH ADDITIONAL CHARGE OF THE MINISTRY OF FOOD PROCESSING INDUSTRIES (SHRI SHARAD YADAV): (a) and (b) A pilot survey on the movement of prices of selected varieties of textiles which was conducted during 1979 by Textile Commitee concluded that trade margin differences between ex-mill prices and retail prices in case of selected varieties of synthetic and blended textiles ranged between 40 per cent to 50 per cent in the local market at Bombay. The trade margin in case of up-country centres in the interior and away from production centres was further higher by about 10 per cent. In February, 1990, the percentage difference between ex-mill and retail prices was between 99.2 per cent to 55.1 per cent.

(c) Does not arise in view of (a) and (b) above.

(d) The concessions given in 1988-89 Budget were not fully passed on to the consumer mainly because of increase in the prices of raw-material which go into the manufacture of these fibres/yarns.

(e) Government Notifications are issued in public interest and in good faith. In order to ensure that benefits of such concessions are passed on to ultimate consumer, periodical review and monitoring of prices etc. is done by the Government.

Payment of customs duty by M/s Bombay Dyeing

1009. SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA:
DR. RATNAKAR PANDEY:
SHRI SURESH PACHOURI:

Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 1095 given in the Rajya Sabha in 2nd March, 1989 and state:

(a) whether the Customs, Excise & Gold (Control) Appellate Tribunal has disposed off the miscellaneous application filed by Government regarding the payment of Customs duty on DMT plant by M/s. Bombay Dyeing;

(b) if so, what are the details there of; and

(c) what further action is contem plated by Government in the matter?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI ANIL SHASTRI): (a) and (b) Customs, Excise and Gold (Control) Appellate Tribunal (CEGAT) has finally disposed off the Miscellaneous application and the appeal and has remanded the matter back to Collector of Customs, Bombay for re-adjudication on some points.

(c) In view of (a) and (b) above, the Collector of Customs, Bombay will be taking further action in the matter in terms of the orders of the CEGAT.

Criterion for Appointment of Solicitors by Public Financial Institutions

1010. SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA: Will tre Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) what is the criterion for appointment of solicitors by public financial institutions;

(b) whether there is any prescribed ceiling in respect of fees payable to the solicitor companies;

(c) what amount of fees has been paid in the recent court cases on the L and T takeover under different heads to the solicitors, M/s. Amarchand and Mangaldas and Hiralal Shroff and company;

(d) whether this amount has been paid only by LIC or it has been shared by other public financial institutions also; and

(e) what amount has been paid by each institution to the solicitor company if the total amount of fees has been shared by different public financial institutions?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI ANIL SHASTRI): (a) Industrial Development Bank of India (IDBI) has reported that the Advocates/Solicitors are appointed keeping in view their standing, nature of the case and the stakes involved.

(b) There is no prescribed ceiling in respect of fees payable to the Solicitors|Advocates.

(c) to (e) Since some of the petitions/appeals are still pending before the Supreme Court, final bills for payment are yet to be settled. It is reported that the fees are to be shared equally by the Financial Institutions viz. Life Insurance Corporation of India (LIC), General Insurance Corporation of India (GIC), Unit Trust of India (UTI), Industrial Finance Corporation of India (IFCI) and Industrial Development Bank of India (IDBI). The amounts paid as on 31-3-1990 as on-account payment by various Financial Institutions was as follows:

Name of the Financial Institutions	Amount Paid (In Rs.)
IDBI	20,00,000
UTI	23,90,000
LIC	5,00,000
GIC	10,65,000

Synthetic blended fabrics produced under the schemes 'Sulabh' 'Sushman' 'Saubhagya'

1011. SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA: Will the Minister of TEXTILES be pleased to state:

(a) what quantity of synthetic/synthetic blended fabrics was produced in 1989-90 through the schemes like 'Sulabh' 'Sushman' and Saubhagya', etc. to make available cheaper synthetic/synthetic blended fabrics to the common man;

(b) whether it is a fact that not even a single metre of fabrics has been produced under the 'Sushman' and 'Saubhagya' although these schemes were introduced by Government more than two years back; and

(c) if the answer to part (b) above be in the negative, what quantity was exactly produced by the handloom sector under these schemes?

THE MINISTER OF TEXTILES WITH ADDITIONAL CHARGE OF THE MINISTRY OF FOOD PRCESSSING INDUSTRIES (SHRI SHARAD YADAV): (a) During the year 1989-90, NTC Mills produced 16.75 lakh metres of 'Sulabh' fabrics and 0.13 lakh metres of cloth under the 'Saubhagya' scheme. However, there was no production of 'Sushman' cloth by the Handloom Sector during 1989-90.

(b) and (c) No, Sir. During the period 1987-88 to 1989-90, the NTC Mills produced 0.78 lakhs metres of cloth under the 'Saubhagya' scheme approved by the Government in November, 1987. The Handloom Sector produced about 62,000 metres of